Edip Yuksel vs. Ali Sina Round 5 Part 16

Edip Yuksel vs. Ali Sina

Round V

Back < > Next

After mistranslating the word Jizya you made the following statement:

> "Unfortunately, the distortion in the meaning of the verse above and the practice of collecting a special tax from Christians and Jews, contradict the basic principle of the Quran that there should not be compulsion in religion and there should be freedom of belief and expression (2:256; 4:90; 10:99; 18:29; 88:21,22). Since taxation based on religion creates financial duress on people to convert to the previliged religion, it violates this important Quranic principle. Dividing a population that united under a social contract (constitution) into previliged groups based on their religion contradicts many principles of the Quran, including justice, peace, and brotherhood/sisterhood of all humanity."

What you have failed to see is the fact that the Quran was written over a period of 23 years and the early writings of Muhammad are very distinct from latter ones. When Muhammad started his prophetic career, he had no earthly powers and the verses that he wrote during that period are all conciliatory and tolerant. During the early phase of his mission, he sounded almost like Christ.

In the verse 2.256 he says:

"__Let there be no compulsion in religion: Truth stands out clear from Error". And

"*If it had been thy Lord's will, they would all have believed,- all who are on earth! wilt thou then compel mankind, against their will, to believe!__"* 10:99 Or

"The truth is from your Lord": Let him who will believe, and let him who will, reject (it)" 18:29.

But these are the Meccan verses. He wrote these verses when he was weak. It would have been impossible for his handful of followers to wage war against thousands of unbelievers and win. In these verses the cunning prophet contented himself by telling his followers that the unbelievers will be severely punished in the afterlife as the verse 18:29 makes it clear where he tries to impress and frighten his gullible followers with his bogus lies about hellfire and his bugabear deity.

"We have prepared a Fire whose (smoke and flames), like the walls and roof of a tent, will hem them in: if they implore relief they will be granted water like melted brass, that will scald

their faces, how dreadful the drink! How uncomfortable a couch to recline on!"

How can any sane person believe that the maker of this universe is a sadist with this much insanity and penchant for torture is beyond comprehension!

However when Muhammad became powerful and managed to fool a sizable number of ignorant men who rallied around him and who were ready to kill at his behest, his so called "revelations" underwent a new twist and he took it upon himself to bring upon those who denied his claim the severest punishments.

So while in Mecca he said "Speak good to men... " 2:83, "be patient with what they say" 20:103 , 73:10 , and preached about the virtues of Abel saying to Cain: "If thou dost stretch thy hand against me, to slay me, it is not for me to stretch my hand against thee to slay thee: for I do fear Allah, the cherisher of the worlds" 5:28, when he went to Medina and became powerful he revealed his true self and a different kind of message. There he wrote: "Oh ye who believe! Murder those of the disbelievers and let them find harshness in you" 9:123 ; "I will instill terror into the hearts of the unbelievers: smite ye above their necks and smite all their finger-tips off. " 8:12 , "Whoso desires another religion than Islam, it shall not be accepted of him" 3:85 , "Strive against the disbelievers and the hypocrites, and be stern with them" 66:9 , "When you meet the unbelievers, strike off their heads; then when you have made wide slaughter among them, carefully tie up the remaining captives" 47:4 , "rouse the Believers to the fight" 8:65, "Against them make ready your strength to the utmost of your power, including steeds of war, to strike terror into (the hearts of) the enemies, of Allah and your enemies". 8:60.

In fact most of the Quran is filled with such violent verses. Definitely the verses written in Medina contradict those written in Mecca. Which ones should we take? Logics says that if I tell you one thing now and another thing the next day, you should follow my last instructions. The latest verses of the Quran are those written in Medina and they are the harsh and violent ones. The very last sura of the Quran is Sura 9, the sura we discussed above. This sura is basically the Will and Testament of Muhammad. If any part of the Quran is in contradictions with what this sura says, it is obvious that the latest words of Muhammad (i,e. sura 9) should override the previous ones.

Dr. Muhsin Khan the translator of Sahih Bukhari and the Quran into English writes:

"Allah revealed in Sura Bara'at the order to discard (all) obligations (covenants, etc), and commanded the Muslims to fight against all the Pagans as well as against the people of the Scriptures (Jews and Christians) if they do not embrace Islam, till they pay the Jizia (a tax levied on the Jews and Christians) with willing submission and feel themselves subdued (as it is revealed in 9:29). So the Muslims were not permitted to abandon "the fighting" against them (Pagans, Jews and Christians) and to reconcile with them and to suspend hostilities against them for an unlimited period while they are STRONG and have the ability to fight against them. So at first "the fighting" was forbidden, then it was permitted, and after that it was made obligatory "[Introduction to English translation of Sahih Bukhari, p.xxiv.]

Q 9:5 reads: "*Slay the idolaters wherever you find them*"
According to Dr. Khan in 9:5 Allah ordered Muhammad to cancel all covenants and to fight the pagans, the Jews even the Christians. This is in contrast to what Muhammad wrote earlier.

"Thou wilt find the nearest of them in love to the believers [Muslims} are those who say 'We are Christians'" (5:82)

Dr. Khan continues:

The "Mujahideen who fight against the enemies of Allah in order that the worship should be all for Allah (alone and not for any other deity) and that the word is Allah's (i.e. none has the right to be worshipped but Allah and His religion Islam) should be upper most."

So first it was "T*here is no compulsion in religion"* (2:265) and then

"O who believe! shall I direct you to a commerce that which will save you from a painful torment? That you believe in Allah and His Apostle (Mohammad), and that you strive hard and fight in the cause of Allah with your wealth and your lives. That will be better for you, if you but knew. If you do so He will forgive you your sins, and admit you into gardens of Eternity - that is the great success" (61:10-12)

Dr. Sobhy as-Saleh, a contemporary academic, does not see in 2:256 and 9:73 a case of abrogation but a case of delaying or postponing the command to fight the infidels. To support his view he quoted Imam Suyuti the author of Itqan Fi 'Ulum al- Qur'an who wrote:

"The command to fight the infidels was DELAYED UNTIL THE MUSLIMS BECOME STRONG, but when they were weak they were commanded to endure and be patient.
[Sobhy as_Saleh, Mabaheth Fi 'Ulum al- Qur'an, Dar al-'Ilm Lel-Malayeen, Beirut , 1983, p. 269.]

Dr. Sobhy, in a footnote, commends the opinion of a scholar named Zarkashi who said:

"Allah the most high and wise revealed to Mohammad in his weak condition what suited the situation, because of his mercy to him and his followers. For if He gave them the command to fight while they were weak it would have been embarrassing and most difficult, but when the most high made Islam victorious He commanded him with what suited the situation, that is asking the people of the Book to become Muslims or to pay the levied tax, and the infidels to become Muslims or face death. These two options, to fight or to have peace return according to the strength or the weakness of the Muslims."[ibid p. 270]

And Nahas writes:

"the scholars differed concerning Q. 2:256. (There is no compulsion if religion) Some said: 'It has been abrogated [cancelled] for the Prophet compelled the Arabs to embrace Islam and fought them and did not accept any alternative but their surrender to Islam. The abrogating verse is Q. 9:73 'O Prophet, struggle with the unbelievers and hypocrites, and be thou harsh

with them.' Mohammad asked Allah the permission to fight them and it was granted. Other scholars said Q. 2:256 has not been abrogated, but it had a special application. It was revealed concerning the people of the Book [the Jews and the Christians]; they can not be compelled to embrace Islam if they pay the Jizia (that is head tax on free non-Muslims under Muslim rule). It is only the idol worshippers who are compelled to embrace Islam and upon them Q. 9:73 applies. This is the opinion of Ibn 'Abbas which is the best opinion due to the authenticity of its chain of authority."[al-Nahas, An-Nasikh wal-Mansukh, p.80. See also Ibn Hazm al-Andalusi, A-Nnasikh wal-Mansukh, Dar al-Kotob al-'Elmeyah, birute, 1986, p.42.]

Ibn Hazm al-Andalusi writes:

"Fight in the way of God with those who fight with you, but aggress not: God loves not the aggressors (2:190)" On the authority of Ga'far ar-Razi from Rabi' Ibn 'Ons, from 'Abil-'Aliyah who said: This is the first verse that was revealed in the Qur'an about fighting in the Madina. When it was revealed the prophet used to fight those who fight with him and avoid those who avoid him, until Sura 9 was revealed. And so is the opinion of 'Abd ar-Rahman Ibn Zayd Ibn 'Aslam who said this verse was cancelled by 9:5 "Slay the idolaters wherever you find them"[bn Hazm al-Andalusi, An-Nasikh wal- Mansukh, Dar al-Kotob al-'Elmeyah, birute, 1986, P.27]

Now what these eminent scholars of Islam say make sense. Logically the latter revelations override and cancel the previous ones if they contradict each other. But what you say make completely no sense. Your claim is informed by your zealotry and blind faith and not by facts.

You also copy pasted an argument you had with Christians. Although I find it irrelevant to our debate, I would like to point out the fact that you yourself are guilty of the same sins you blame your Christian opponents. Let us go over the six points you raised:

1. You are the one who denies the fact that the Quran is NOT self-sufficient. I asked you a few questions about the Quran. Explain them without referring to haidth. Explain how do you know Muhammad was born in 570 A.D. and declared his message at 40 without referring to haidth. You can't do that without the aid of the hadith and sira and therefore your claim that ALL the haidth is garbage and the Quran is self-sufficient is fallacious.
2. It is you who reduce your references to smaller portion, take a few abrogated verses and disregard the rest of the Quran where it clearly calls for blood and violence. It is you who are scared to show the ugly part of the Quran for the fear of being shown that the man you have accepted to be a prophet was a psychopath. Let us say the Quran has also a good part. Is there a book, including Mein Kampf, that is completely bereft of any good part? What you fail to see is that a few allegedly "good" verses in the Quran are not enough to call it a divine book. **A book of a perfect God should not have even one ugly or imperfect verse in it.** And yet we find hundreds of ugly and terrible verses in the Quran.
3. It is you who twist the meaning of some of the words and “**suggest**” that they should be interpreted differently to suit your “reformist” agenda. To fulfill your agenda, what you

have sacrificed is the truth.

4. It is you who selectively deny some of the hadith but cling to others because you realize without them you can't even establish the existence of Muhammad.
5. The argument used in point 5 is a logical fallacy called *tu quoque*. By using this fallacy you try to justify the crimes perpetrated by Muhammad and his followers with the wrongs committed by the followers of other religions. Followers of other religions were mere followers. Their actions should not reflect on their religion just as the action of the Muslims should not reflect on Islam. The followers could be misguided. We are not blaming the Muslims but Muhammad himself. If Muhammad was a prophet of God indeed, he should have known better.
6. In point 6 again you are attacking the Christians and their conducts. Even if your accusations are proven to be true, how with this, you can justify the crimes of Muhammad or the violence and absurdities of the Quran?

The rest of your message, is a misplaced copy-paste. It has nothing to so with our discussion. It is a discussion you had with Christians. Why you bring that up here is not clear to me. But since you mentioned it let me dismiss it as another *tu quoque* fallacy. Here you are trying to vilify Christianity and Judaism to get away with the sins of Muhammad. Suppose whatever you say about these religions is true. Would that prove that Muhammad was a prophet of God? Wouldn't this be another proof that he was not a messenger of God? Muhammad said Jesus and Moses were prophets of God. If you show they were not, then doesn't this automatically make Muhammad a liar? Irrespective of the fact that you succeeded or not, by simply questioning their prophethoood you have challenged Muhammad and his authority and you are not a Muslim.

At this stage, I request you to please come back and debate the points that I am discussing, in the same way I am debating the points that you raise. If all you can do is copy paste irrelevant articles and rehash what you wrote in other occasions, I don't see any debate and wonder what we are doing here. This is supposed to be a debate. If you are reluctant even to engage with me, if all you can do is copy paste irrelevant material and expect me to answer them without you contesting my points, is there any point in continuing? Weren't you the person who accused the Christians of "parroting"? Aren't you doing the same here?

You seem to have run out of arguments before we even engage and hence with these tedious copy pasting and filibustering tactics you try to bore the readers and find your way out of this discussion. Please prove to us this is not the case.

If this is what you intend, I suggest you would be saving face more by not responding at all. Dr. Zakir Naik, Prof. Michael Sells and Prof. John Esposito are far better now for not responding to me than if they did and failed to engage in coherent arguments. If you are gasping for relief, you may stop, but if you truly want to debate please do not burden me and the readers with long tedious and irrelevant copy pastes.

Finally I would like to speak to your heart. If you can't defend Islam, why you cling to this sinking ship? Islam is a lie and this I have proven here in numerous articles time and again.

Why hang to a doctrine that is so evil and so false? I earnestly urge you to leave Islam. You can't save Islam nor can you reform it. Islam is based on total lies. It is not a religion of God but a cult created by a psychopath to control and dominate the gullible. Its *fruit* speaks for itself.

I call upon all the Muslims to leave Islam. Islam is a lie. The sooner we face this truth the sooner we save our own souls and this battered world. By adhering to this cult we are lending our tacit support to the terrorists. We are committing a sin against our own souls and against our own children. You are responsible for what you believe. Do not be an instrument of hate and destruction. Be an instrument of love and unity of mankind. Let us rebuild this wrecked world together. Let us mend our tattered brotherhood. We are all brothers and sisters in Humanity. You know the maxim of "divide and rule". How can you let yourself to become a victim of this evil ploy? The world is not divided between Muslims and Kafirs. It is not created as dar al Harb and dar al Islam. This is one planet for all of us to share, to cherish and to love.

Enough with insanity! Enough with hatred. Muhammad lied to us. Let us wake up from our slumber. Let us leave this doctrine of hate aside and let us step into the world of love and light. Let us do it now for tomorrow is too late.